arXiv:hep-th/9711095v1 13 Nov 1997

Vacuum Nodes in QCD at $\theta = \pi$: Exact Results

M. Asorey and F. Falceto,

Departamento de Física Teórica. Facultad de Ciencias

Universidad de Zaragoza. 50009 Zaragoza. Spain

Abstract

We show that the vacuum functional of 3+1 dimensional non-abelian gauge theories vanishes for some classical field configurations $\psi_0(A) = 0$ when the coefficient of the CP violating θ–term becomes $\theta = \pi$ (mod. 2π). Some of these classical configurations are explicitly identified and include sphalerons. The results shed new light into the non-perturbative behavior of non-abelian gauge theories and suggest a relevant role for these classical configurations in the confinement mechanism at $\theta = 0$.

Typeset using REVTEX

In spite of the great phenomenological success of QCD we are still lacking a good understanding of the non-perturbative behavior of the theory in the strong coupling regime. The only known rigorous results on the low energy regime of QCD concern the existence of fermion mass inequalities [1] and the absence of parity symmetry breaking in vector-like theories [2]. However, after so many years there has been little progress in the analytic understanding of the mechanisms of confinement and chiral symmetry breaking. In particular, the role of relevant classical field configurations in those phenomena is not clear yet.

Very recently a new analytic approach made possible the understanding of such mechanisms in supersymmetric gauge theories [3]. The results support the t' Hooft-Mandelstam dual superconducting scenario for the low energy dynamics of the theory.

In this note, following a different approach we obtain non-perturbative information on the structure of QCD in the strong coupling regime. The main idea is to analyse the response of QCD vacuum to the effect of the θ–term. The same idea has been very fruitful in the understanding the vacuum structure of 2+1 dimensional gauge theories [4]. In such a case the effect of a Chern-Simons perturbation leads to the appearance of vacuum nodes and deconfined quarks. Some of those nodes appear for abelian magnetic monopole configurations which suggested a relevant role for those configurations in the confinement mechanisms and supported the dual superconducting scenario for quark confinement. In this note we show that similar results hold for the 3+1 dimensional case.

In the temporal gauge ($A_0 = 0$) and Schrödinger representation [6], the quantum Hamiltonian of Yang-Mills theory with a θ–term is given by

$$\mathbb{H}_\theta = \int d^3x \ \mathrm{Tr} \left\{ g^2 \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta A_k} - \frac{i\theta}{16\pi^2} \epsilon_{kjl} F^{jl} \right) \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta A^k} - \frac{i\theta}{16\pi^2} \epsilon^{kjl} F_{jl} \right) - \frac{1}{2g^2} F^{jk} F_{jk} \right\} . \qquad (1)$$

Because of Gauss law constraint

$$D^k_A \frac{\delta}{\delta A_k} \psi_{\rm ph}(A) = 0, \qquad (2)$$

the physical states must be gauge invariant functionals, i.e. $\psi_{\rm ph}(A^\phi) = \psi_{\rm ph}(A)$ for any gauge transformation ϕ with $A^\phi_\mu = \phi^{-1} A_\mu \phi + \phi^{-1} \partial_\mu \phi$. Since the physical states are constant

along the gauge orbits, they can be identified with functionals on the space of gauge orbits $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{G}$, i.e. the quotient space of the space of 3-dimensional gauge fields $\mathcal{A}$ by the group of gauge transformations $\mathcal{G}$.

The same constraint analysis led to the existence of nodes in all physical states of $2+1$ dimensional gauge theories with a Chern-Simons term, because these states are sections of a non-trivial line bundle over $\mathcal{M}$ [5]. In the present case the Gauss law is not so stringent and the existence of nodes cannot be derived from pure kinematical properties.

Moreover, there is a fundamental technical difference between the two cases. In 2+1 dimensions the only ultraviolet divergence appears into the vacuum energy. Therefore a trivial constant subtraction is enough to renormalize the quantum Hamiltonian and to give sense to the Schrödinger formalism. However, in 3+1 the structure of divergences becomes more involved and one has to renormalize also the wave fields and the coupling constant. In order to have a control of the ultraviolet divergences and the renormalization of the theory we introduce an ultraviolet regularization of the Hamiltonian (1)

$$\mathbb{H}_\theta^{\rm reg} = \int d^3x \ {\rm Tr} \left\{ g^2 \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta A_k} - \frac{i\theta}{16\pi^2} \epsilon_{kjl} F^{jl} \right) (I + \frac{\Delta_A}{\Lambda^2})^{-n} \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta A^k} - \frac{i\theta}{16\pi^2} \epsilon^{kjl} F_{jl} \right) - \frac{1}{2g^2} F^{jk} F_{jk} \right\}$$

of the type considered in [7]. In this framework the Schrödinger formalism of the the quantum theory [7] [8] becomes as safe as in the 2+1 dimensional case [9].

The non-trivial effect of the θ–term is due to the non-simply connected character of the orbit space $\pi_1(\mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{Z}$ or what is equivalent the non-connected character of the group of gauge transformations $\pi_0(\mathcal{G}) = \mathbb{Z}$. In physical terms, for instance, monopoles are turned into dyons by this effect [10]. The regularized Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\mathbb{H}_\theta^{\rm reg} = \int d^3x \ {\rm Tr} \left\{ g^2 \mathbb{D}_j^\theta (I + \frac{\Delta_A}{\Lambda^2})^{-n} \mathbb{D}_\theta^j - \frac{1}{2g^2} F^{jk} F_{jk} \right\},$$

where

$$\mathbb{D}_j^\theta = \frac{\delta}{\delta A_j} - i \frac{\theta}{16\pi^2} \epsilon_{jkl} F^{kl}, \tag{3}$$

is a functional covariant derivative with respect to the U(1) ultra-gauge field defined over the space of gauge fields $\mathcal{A}$ by the ultra-gauge vectior potential

$$\alpha_j^\theta = \frac{\theta}{16\pi^2}\epsilon_{jkl}F^{kl}. \tag{4}$$

The projection of this vector potential into the orbit space $\mathcal{M}$ is non-trivial for any value of $\theta \neq 2n\pi$. Actually, the projection of the potential $(1/\theta)\alpha^\theta$ is a generating form of the non-trivial first cohomology group $H^1(\mathcal{M},\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ of $\mathcal{M}$. In this sense the phenomenon is very similar to the Aharanov-Bohm effect, and the effect of the θ–term cannot be globally removed by a gauge transformation over the space of gauge orbits [7].

It is, however, possible to find a codimension one submanifold $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{M}$ and perform a gauge transformation on its complement $\mathcal{M} - \mathcal{N}$ which removes the θ–dependence of the Hamiltonian. The price to pay is the appearence of non-trivial boundary conditions at $\mathcal{N}$. In this sense the transformation which is not globally defined on $\mathcal{M}$ trades the θ–dependence of the Hamiltonian by suitable boundary conditions at $\mathcal{N}$.

Although the choice for $\mathcal{N}$ is not unique, it is convenient for later purposes to choose $\mathcal{N} = \{[A] \in \mathcal{M}; S_{\rm CS} = (2n+1)\pi\}$, where

$$S_{\rm CS}(A) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int d^3x\ \epsilon^{jkl}{\rm Tr}\left(A_j\partial_k A_l + \frac{2}{3}A_jA_kA_l\right) \tag{5}$$

is the Chern-Simons functional. It is trivial to show that the gauge orbits of the open subsets of gauge fields $\mathcal{B}_n = \{A \in \mathcal{A}; (2n-1)\pi < S_{\rm CS}(A) < (2n+1)\pi)\}$ completely fill the space $\mathcal{M}-\mathcal{N}$. In a similar manner, $\mathcal{N}$ is made up of the orbits of the codimension one submanifolds $\mathcal{K}_n = \{A \in \mathcal{A}; S_{\rm CS}(A) = (2n+1)\pi\}$ of $\mathcal{A}$. Then the transformation $\xi(A) = {\rm e}^{-\frac{i\theta}{2\pi}S_{\rm CS}(A)}\psi_{\rm ph}(A)$ is uniquely defined on the domain $\mathcal{B}_0$ and the quantum Hamiltonian becomes θ–independent under such a transformation, $\widetilde{\mathbb{H}}_\theta^{\rm reg} = {\rm e}^{-\frac{i\theta}{2\pi}S_{\rm CS}(A)}\mathbb{H}_\theta^{\rm reg}{\rm e}^{\frac{i\theta}{2\pi}S_{\rm CS}(A)} = \mathbb{H}_0^{\rm reg}$. The θ dependence is encoded in the non-trivial boundary conditions that physical states have to verify now at the boundaries $\mathcal{K}_{-1}$ and $\mathcal{K}_0$ of the domain $\mathcal{B}_0$,

$$\xi(A_+) = {\rm e}^{-i\theta}\xi(A_-) \tag{6}$$

for any pair of gauge fields $A_- \in \mathcal{K}_{-1}$ and $A_+ \in \mathcal{K}_0$ which are gauge equivalent $A_+ = A_-^\phi$ by a gauge transformation with winding number $\nu(\phi) = 1$. In this sense the transformation is trading the θ–dependence of the Hamiltonian by non-trivial boundary conditions on $\mathcal{N}$.

We can now identify some physically relevant gauge field configurations dwelling on this boundary $\mathcal{N}$. In the center of our domain $\mathcal{B}_0$ we have the classical Yang-Mills vacuum, $A_{\rm vac}=0$. The other n-vacua classical configurations $A_{\rm n\cdot vac}=\phi_n^{-1}d\phi_n$ belong to the different disconnected open domains $\mathcal{B}_n$ of $\mathcal{A}$ with $\nu(\phi_n)=n$. In the boundary of the domain $\mathcal{B}_0$ we have sphalerons $A_{\rm sph}$ and anti-sphalerons $\widetilde{A}_{\rm sph}$. They are defined for finite volumes as static, unstable solutions of Yang-Mills equations with only one unstable direction. They appear for any compact 3 dimensional space Σ due to the non-simply connected character of the gauge orbit space $\mathcal{M}$ [11]. The explicit expression, however is only known for some special manifolds. In the case of the sphere $\Sigma=S^3$, the first sphaleron is given by the 3-dimensional gauge field configuration induced by the 4-dimensional BPST instanton on the 3-dimensional sphere centered at the center of the instanton and with radius equal to the size of the instanton [12]. The unstable mode corresponds to the radial perturbation generated by the flow of the instanton. In stereographic projection coordinates, it has the following expression

$$A_{\rm sph}{}^a_j=\frac{4\rho}{(x^2+(2\rho)^2)^2}\left(4\rho\epsilon^{ajk}x^k-2x^ax_j+(x^2-(2\rho)^2)\delta^a_j\right). \tag{7}$$

where ρ is the radius of the sphere and also the size of the instanton. A relevant property of this sphalerons is that for them the Chern-Simons action $S_{\rm cs}(A_{\rm sph})=\pi$ reachs the value π. This property which turns out to be crucial for our analysis is independent of the size of the sphere because the Chern-Simons functional is metric independent, and implies that $A_{\rm sph}\in\mathcal{K}_0$. The only change when we modify the metric of the sphere, e.g. we increase the value of its radius ρ to get an infinite volume $\mathbb{R}^3$, is that the configuration $A_{\rm sph}$ will not be anymore a solution of Yang-Mills equation but this fact will have no relevance for our discussion. There is another configuration $\widetilde{A}_{\rm sph}$ with similar properties generated by the anti-instanton,

$$\widetilde{A}_{\rm sph}{}^a_j=\frac{4\rho}{(x^2+4\rho^2)^2}\left[4\rho\epsilon^{ajk}x^k+2x^ax_j-(x^2-(2\rho)^2)\delta^a_j\right]. \tag{8}$$

with $S_{\rm cs}(\widetilde{A}_{\rm sph})=-\pi$, i.e. $\widetilde{A}_{\rm sph}\in\mathcal{K}_{-1}$.

An interesting connection between these two configurations is that they are gauge equivalent $A_{\rm sph} = \widetilde{A}^{\Phi}_{\rm sph}$ under a gauge transformation

$$\Phi(x) = \frac{1}{x^2 + 4\rho^2} \left[(x^2 - 4\rho^2) I - 8\rho \tau_j x^j \right] . \tag{9}$$

with winding number $\nu(\Phi) = 1$. Therefore, our physical states satisfy that $\xi(A_{\rm sph}) = {\rm e}^{-i\theta} \xi(\widetilde{A}_{\rm sph})$ on sphalerons configurations.

Now, the relevant property which will allow us to extract some information on the quantum vacua nodal structure is that the theory is CP invariant for $\theta = \pi$. The theory is C invariant for any value of θ, but parity is not preserved unless $\theta = \pi$. In the Hamiltonian approach this property of the special case $\theta = \pi$ comes from the fact that the boundary condition (6), becomes an anti-periodic boundary condition, $\xi(A_+) = -\xi(A_-)$, which is a CP invariant condition, because the gauge fields of the boundary $\mathcal{K}_0$ are transformed into fields of $\mathcal{K}_{-1}$ and conversely. This is dictated by the odd transformation of the Chern-Simons action under parity (charge conjugation leaves invariant the Chern-Simons and Yang-Mills terms). In fact, we have that ${\rm P}\mathcal{K}_{n-1} = \mathcal{K}_{-n}$, which also implies that the submanifold $\mathcal{N}$ is invariant under parity.

Let us now consider the full Hilbert space of physical states $\mathcal{H}$ defined exclusively by the anti-periodic boundary condition. This means that we are not presupposing anything on the possible existence of superselection sectors in $\mathcal{H}$ and spontaneous breaking of CP symmetry. In such a Hilbert space it is always possible to find a complete basis of stationary wave functionals with definite CP symmetry. If the energy level is not degenerate the corresponding physical state $\xi(A)$ has to be CP even or CP odd. In the degenerate case, if $U(P)\xi(A)$ is not on the same ray that $\xi(A)$, the stationary functionals $\xi_\pm(A) = \xi(A) \pm U(P)\xi(A)$ are parity even/odd, respectively. Notice that because of the CP invariance of the anti-periodic boundary conditions, $\xi_\pm(A)$ also satisfy the same conditions. If CP is spontaneously broken the quantum vacua $\xi_0(A)$ in the different physical phases will not have a definite parity ($\xi_0 \neq \xi_\pm$) and the Hilbert space will split into superselection sectors not connected by local observables.

The behavior of sphalerons and classical vacuum configurations under parity is rather different. The classical vacuum $A_{\rm vac}=0$ is P invariant ($A^P_{\rm vac}=A_{\rm vac}$) whereas the sphaleron it is not, but it is transformed into a gauge equivalent configuration, i.e. $A^P_{\rm sph}=\widetilde{A}_{\rm sph}=A^\Phi_{\rm sph}$, with $\nu(\Phi)=1$. In fact, the whole submanifold $\mathcal{N}\in\mathcal{M}$ is CP invariant, but the sphaleron has an additional peculiarity, it is quasi-invariant under parity transformation.

Now, because of anti-periodic boundary conditions, we have that $U(P)\xi_0(A_{\rm sph})=\xi_0(\widetilde{A}_{\rm sph})=\xi_0(A^\Phi_{\rm sph})=-\xi_0(A_{\rm sph})$. If the vacuum is parity even this is possible only if ξ_0 vanishes for sphaleron configurations, $\xi_0(A_{\rm sph})=0$,. On the other hand, since $U(P)\xi_0(A_{\rm vac})=\xi_0(A^P_{\rm vac})=\xi_0(A_{\rm vac})$, if ξ_0 is parity odd, it vanishes for classical vacuum configurations. Now, in the regularized theory there is no running of the coupling constant and the potential Yang-Mills term of the Hamiltonian, is not suppressed in the infrared. This term, thus, gives a finite positive contribution to the energy of stationary states. Therefore, the parity even states which vanish at sphalerons cannot have the same energy as parity odd states which vanish at classical vacuum configurations where the potential terms attaints its minimal value. This feature implies that: i) the quantum vacuum state $\psi_0(A)$ has to be parity even, ii) it vanishes at $A_{\rm sph}$ and iii) CP symmetry is not spontaneously broken in the regularized theory.

In the above derivation of the vanishing of the quantum vacuum functional ψ_0 for sphalerons, the only relevant ingredients were the quasi-invariance of these gauge fields under parity and the special value of Chern-Simons functional $S_{\rm CS}(A_{\rm sph})=\pi$ for them. Therefore the results can be extended for any gauge field satisfying the same properties. The space of such gauge field configurations is infinite dimensional. Infinitesimally, the perturbations $A=A_{\rm sph}+\epsilon\tau+\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$ of $A_{\rm sph}$ given by $\tau(x)=-\eta(-x)+\Phi\eta\Phi^\dagger(x)+D_{A_{\rm sph}}\varphi(x)$ preserve both properties, for any perturbation of gauge fields η and any infinitesimal gauge transformation φ. Therefore such perturbations generate an infinite subspace of nodal configurations for ψ_0 in $\mathcal{K}_0$. The same configurations are also nodes of any higher energy stationary states with even parity $\psi_{\rm even}(A_{\rm sph})=0$. The nodal configurations of parity odd excited states contain the classical vacuum configurations $\psi_{\rm odd}(A_{\rm vac})=0$.

Since these results hold for any value of the ultraviolet regulator Λ and the coupling constant g, they also hold in the renormalized theory. In the particular case of absence of spontaneous breaking of the symmetry the result is even more evident because the phenomenon related to the infrared properties of the theory which are the same for the regularized and renormalized theories.

There is an independent proof of the same results. The euclidean time evolution kernel of the regularized theory from an sphaleron to the classical vacuum is given by [7]

$$K_T^\theta(A_{\rm sph}, A_{\rm vac}) =< A_{\rm sph}|e^{-TH_\theta^{\rm reg}}|A_{\rm vac} >= \int_{\substack{A(0)=A_{\rm vac}\\ A(T)=A_{\rm sph}}} \delta A \quad \exp\left\{-\int_0^T dt \int d^3x \mathcal{L}_\theta^{\rm reg}\right\}. \qquad (10)$$

This kernel is dependent on the choice of the U(1) gauge over $\mathcal{M}$, but in the pseudo-periodic gauge (6) it is given by the above path integral prescription. Parity transformation involves a change in (10) of the boundary conditions of gauge field configurations, $A(T) = \widetilde{A}_{\rm sph}$ instead of $A(T) = A_{\rm sph}$. Therefore, for $\theta = \pi$ we have $PK_T^\pi(A_{\rm sph}, A_{\rm vac}) = K_T^\pi(\widetilde{A}_{\rm sph}, A_{\rm vac})$. Now, the CP transformation of $\mathcal{L}_\theta^{\rm reg}$ is reduced to the change of the θ–term contribution, which becomes $-i\theta(\frac{1}{2}+n)$ instead of $i\theta(\frac{1}{2}+n)$ for any trajectory $A(t)$ in the space of gauge fields $\mathcal{A}$ whose projection on $\mathcal{M}$ has winding number n. This implies that for $\theta = \pi$, the kernel $K_T^\pi(A_{\rm sph}, A_{\rm vac})$ is pure imaginary and thus it is parity odd,

$$PK_T^\pi(A_{\rm sph}, A_{\rm vac}) = -K_T^\pi(A_{\rm sph}, A_{\rm vac}). \qquad (11)$$

On the other hand, as discussed above it is always possible to find in $\mathcal{H}$ a complete basis of eigenfunctionals $\psi_n(A)$ satisfying the anti-periodic boundary conditions with definite parity for $\theta = \pi$. In terms of such a basis, the kernel

$$PK_T^\pi(A_{\rm sph}, A_{\rm vac}) = \sum_n U(P)\psi_n(A_{\rm sph})^* U(P)\psi_n(A_{\rm vac}) {\rm e}^{-E_n T} = K_T^\pi(A_{\rm sph}, A_{\rm vac}), \qquad (12)$$

remains invariant under CP transformations. This is in disagreement with (11) unless $K_T^\pi(A_{\rm sph}, A_{\rm vac}) = 0$, which implies that any stationary state ψ_n either vanishes at $A_{\rm vac}$ or at $A_{\rm sph}$. By the parity symmetry argument discussed above, we know that the first possibility

occurs for parity odd states whereas for parity even eigenstates $\psi(A_{\rm sph}) = 0$. The same argument applies to any pair of field configurations A_0 and A_π with $S_{\rm CS}(A) = 0$ and $S_{\rm CS}(A) = \pi$ and similar transformation properties under parity. Therefore, the vacuum functional ψ_0 vanishes for any field configuration $A \in \mathcal{K}_n$ which is quasi-invariant under parity. In this sense the path integral analysis confirms the result obtained by the Hamiltonian formalism.

On the other hand numerical simulations indicate that the theory ceases to confine [13] at $\theta = \pi$. Thus, one might conjecture that these gauge configurations of $\mathcal{N}$ whose contribution to the vacuum is completely suppressed in the deconfined phase, might play a role in the confinement mechanism when $\theta \neq \pi$. On the other hand the existence of nodes of the vacuum in the sphaleron sector confirms the destructive interference between the instanton and anti-instanton tunneling at $\theta = \pi$, first indicated by semiclassical instanton calculus which provided the first clue on the existence of vacuum nodes. This interference suggests that perhaps the dilute gas approximation is not inappropriate for the $\theta = \pi$ regime.

Similar phenomena occurs in the O(3) σ–model which is exactly solvable [14]. In a discrete formulation it is equivalent by Haldane transformation [15] to a spin $\frac{1}{2}$ chain and for those chains the Lieb-Schulz-Mattis theorem [16] establishes that there are only two possibilities: either parity is spontaneously broken or the mass gap vanishes. Since it is known that the mass gap is zero for $\theta = \pi$ [17] [18], then parity is not spontaneously broken in this model at $\theta = \pi$.

In summary the analysis of CP symmetry contributes to shed some light on the non-perturbative structure of QCD at low energies, and due to the lack of exact results in QCD this information becomes highly valuable. However, the nature and existence of a transition at $\theta = \pi$ remains unveiled, although the behavior of the theory seems to be analogous to that of the O(3) σ–model [19]. Numerical investigations of such a problem would be very interesting to get new insights on the structure of QCD vacuum.

We thank K. Gawędzki, H. Markum, W. Sakuler and G. Sierra for discussions. This work was partially supported by the Human Capital and Mobility Program of the U.E. (Grant No. ERBCHRX-CT92-0035) and CICyT (Grant No. AEN94-0218).

REFERENCES

[1] D. Weingarten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983) 1830; E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983) 2351 ; C. Vafa and E. Witten, Comm. Math. Phys. **95** (1984) 257

[2] C. Vafa and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**(1984) 535 ; Nucl. Phys. **B234** (1984) 173

[3] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B426** (1994) 19; **B431**(1994) 484

[4] M. Asorey, F. Falceto, J.L. López and G. Luzón, Phys. Lett. **B 349** (1995) 125

[5] M. Asorey, in *Geometry and Fields* ed. A. Jadczyk, World Sci, Singapore (1986)

[6] J. Goldstone and R. Jackiw, Phys. Lett **B74** (1978) 81

[7] M. Asorey and P.K. Mitter, Commun. Math. Phys. **80** (1981) 43 ; see also CERN TH-2423 preprint (1982) (unpublished)

[8] K. Symanzik, Nucl. Phys. **B190** (1981) 1

[9] R. Feynman, Nucl. Phys. **B188** (1981) 479

[10] E. Witten, Phys.Lett. **86B** (1979) 283

[11] N. Manton, Phys. Rev. **D28**(1983) 2019; F.R. Klinkhamer and N. Manton, Phys. Rev. **D30**(1984) 2212

[12] J. M. Cerveró and L. Jacobs, *Phys.Lett.* **B 78** (1978) 427; P. van Baal and N.D.Hari Dass, *Nucl.Phys.* **B 385** (1992) 185,; A.V.Smilga, *Nucl.Phys.* **B 459** (1996) 263

[13] S. Olejnik and G. Schierholz, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.)**34** (1994) 709; G. Schierholz, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **37 A** (1994) 203

[14] V. A. Fatteev and Al. B. Zamolodchikov, Phys. Lett. **B271** (1991) 91; A. B. Zamolodchikov and Al. B. Zamolodchikov, Nucl. Phys. **B379** (1992) 602

[15] F.D. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50** (1983) 1153, Phys. Lett. **93 A** (1983) 464; I. Affleck, in *Fields, Strings and Critical Phenomena* ed. E. Brezin and J. Zinn-Justin, North-

Holland, Amsterdam (1988)

[16] E. Lieb, T. Schulz and D. Mattis, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **16** (1961) 16

[17] I.A. Affleck and F.D. Haldane, Phys. Rev. **B36** (1987) 5291

[18] R. Shankar and N. Read, Nucl. Phys. **B336** (1990) 457

[19] M. Asorey, F. Falceto, In preparation